

Remarks

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed May 18, 2004. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment that the Application is in condition for allowance except for certain formal matters. Applicants also appreciate the Examiner's suggestion of clarifying amendments to the claims. Applicants have made certain of the Examiner's suggested amendments and have proposed alternatives to certain other of the Examiner's suggested amendments. Where an alternative is proposed, Applicants have provided explanatory remarks below. These amendments are not considered narrowing or necessary for patentability. Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

Explanatory Remarks regarding Certain Claim Amendments

Independent Claims 1 and 25: The term "bottom" lacked antecedent basis and should have been changed to "first" in a previous Response.

Dependent Claims 2, 4-7, 11-13, 18-21, 26, 28-31, 35-37, and 42-44: Successively numbering the recited displays (e.g., "second," "third," "fourth," etc.) might incorrectly imply that more than two displays are required in each of these claims. Accordingly, to avoid this incorrect implication, "second" has been deleted from these claims and "first" has been deleted from independent Claims 1, 9, 14, 22, 25, 33, 38, and 45. Applicants believe these changes address the Examiner's apparent concern about possible confusion that the previously recited "second" displays are all the same display.

Dependent Claims 3 and 27: Applicants believe no amendments are necessary in light of the clarifying amendments to independent Claims 1 and 25.

Dependent Claim 23: Since "a first axis" is recited in independent Claim 22 on which this claim depends, Applicants believe "the first axis" has appropriate antecedent basis and no amendment is necessary.

Dependent Claims 24 and 47: Similar to dependent Claims 2, 4-7, 11-13, 19-21, 26, 28-31, 35-37, and 42-44 discussed above, Applicants believe no amendments are necessary.

Comments on Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance

Applicants appreciate the Examiner indicating, in the previous Response, that Claims 13, 16-24, and 38-47 are allowable over the references of record. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.104, Applicants respectfully submit a statement commenting on the Examiner's reasons for allowance. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's reasons for allowance to the extent that they are inconsistent with applicable case law, statutes, and regulations. Furthermore, Applicants do not admit to any characterization or limitation of the claims by the Examiner, particularly any that are inconsistent with the language of the claims considered in their entirety and including all of their constituent limitations, or to any characterization of a reference by the Examiner.

Conclusion

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Christopher W. Kennerly, Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6812.

Although Applicants believe no fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Christopher W. Kennerly
Reg. No. 40,675

Correspondence Address:

Customer Number:

05073

Date: 7/19/04